

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

April 20, 2001

LB 242

from communicating that opinion to his or her constituents. And then the Wickersham amendment further narrows that to allowing us the incidental use, the incidental use of public resources; and then also narrows our communication to communication with individual senator...individual constituents as opposed to the mass of constituents. And it is those two narrowings of our prerogatives that I wish to change in the Wickersham amendment. So technically what the amendment does in the Wickersham amendment is to strike the word "incidental" and to strike the word "individual". The effect, the effect and thrust of the amendment, the effect of doing that is to say that we can use our resources to talk about ballot questions except we leave in the Wickersham amendment that we cannot do mass mailings. Okay? But anything else you clearly can do, so you don't have to sit there worrying about whatever it is you're doing, your press release or your press conference or whatever it is. You're not going to have to worry about whether you're violating the law. And in my philosophy, you shouldn't have to worry about whether you're violating the law because you should be able to speak out on these things. Likewise, the word...dropping the word "individual" means that you don't have to worry about whether you're violating the law because you put out a press release and that's a communication to all constituents as opposed to a communication to an individual constituent. I don't think we should have to worry about that distinction. So generally speaking, the thrust of the amendment is to give each one of us greater latitude and freedom of speech with regard to ballot questions, but it does...it leaves untouched in the Wickersham amendment the prohibition against using mass mailings. And I'll...personally I think we should be able to use mass mailings, too, although as each one of you know is we're severely limited in that regard anyway. But I don't mind excluding mass mailings because that's really definable and maybe is something that people would not want us to do. But otherwise, I think the public would be generally supportive of our speaking out. That's what they elected us to do. And on all matters of public policy, whether that policy is formulated within an initiative or a referendum or a statute, whether the initiative and referendum...I mean, a referendum has to refer to a statute, so they're all directly related to our work. And I think we would be remiss, and the public would think we were